



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/799,363

03/12/2004

Frank Beunings

34874-090 UTIL

6370

64280

7590

09/16/2008

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.

ATTN: PATENT INTAKE CUSTOMER NO. 64280

ONE FINANCIAL CENTER

BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2194

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/799,363 | Applicant(s) BEUNINGS ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Charles E. Anya | Art Unit 2194 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3/ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/21/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1, 6 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,779,184 B1 issued to Puri et al.**

3. As to claim 1, Puri teaches a computer-implemented method of accessing content of a message, comprising:

defining a context object for a message (“...common logical definition of the structure of such messages must be established” Col. 5 Ln. 25 – 35, Business Objects 210/220/230), the context object being an abstraction of content of the message, the context object stored in a repository (“...data stores...” Col. 7 Ln. 21 – 29, “...business object...” Col. 6 Ln. 14 – 25);

assigning the context object to one or more interfaces through which the message is to be communicated (“...API...” Col. 2 Ln. 20 – 24, Ln. 33 – 37, “...each business object is represented by a combination of a high level API 104...” Col. 7 Ln. 11 – 29); and

accessing, via the context object, the content of the message at one of the interfaces (“...invoked...to selectively forward the message...”, “...on the direction of the high level APIs to perform...business function of the business object by selectively accessing one...” Col. 7 Ln. 30 – 54 “...specific accesses to the data stores...necessary to process the sales order...” Col. 9 Ln. 10 – 13).

4. As to claims 6 and 11, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

5. As to claim 8, Puri teaches a system in accordance with claim 6, further comprising a directory that stores a plurality of routing rules for routing messages between a sender and one or more receivers through one or more message interfaces (“...maintains rules...” Col. 6 Ln. 46 – 57).

6. As to claim 9, Puri teaches a system in accordance with claim 8, wherein the context objects are assigned to the one or more interfaces according to one or more business processes stored in the directory (“...selected business object...API...” Col. 2 Ln. 15 – 24, Col. 6 Ln. 41 – 57).

Art Unit: 2194

7. As to claim 10, Puri teaches a system in accordance with claim 9, further comprising an integration server for executing the one or more business processes (figure 1 Switch 102/112/122/132, "...switching means..." Col. 2 Ln. 25 – 37, Col. 6 Ln. 41 – 57).

8. As to claim 12, Puri teaches a computer program product in accordance with claim 11, wherein accessing the content includes accessing application data associated with the context object ("...invoked...to selectively forward the message...", "...on the direction of the high level APIs to perform...business function of the business object by selectively accessing one..." Col. 7 Ln. 30 – 54 "...specific accesses to the data stores...necessary to process the sales order..." Col. 9 Ln. 10 – 13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2-5, 7 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,779,184 B1 issued to Puri et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0182843 A1 issued to Reistad et al.

Art Unit: 2194

10. As to claim 2, Puri teaches a computer-implemented method in accessing content of a message, comprising:

defining a context object for a message (“...common logical definition of the structure of such messages must be established” Col. 5 Ln. 25 – 35, Business Objects 210/220/230), the context object being an abstraction of content of the message, the context object stored in a repository (“...data stores...” Col. 7 Ln. 21 – 29, “...business object...” Col. 6 Ln. 14 – 25);

assigning, to the one or more interfaces through which the message is to be communicated, the context object describing the message (“...API...” Col. 2 Ln. 20 – 24, Ln. 33 – 37, “...each business object is represented by a combination of a high level API 104...” Col. 7 Ln. 11 – 29); and

accessing, via the context object, the content of the message at one of the interfaces, wherein accessing the content includes accessing application data associated with the context object (“...invoked...to selectively forward the message...”, “...on the direction of the high level APIs to perform...business function of the business object by selectively accessing one...” Col. 7 Ln. 30 – 54 “...specific accesses to the data stores...necessary to process the sales order...” Col. 9 Ln. 10 – 13).

Puri is silent with reference to criteria to enable reuse across one or more interfaces, the context object providing the criteria for determining one or more send steps at one of the interfaces.

Reistad teaches criteria to enable reuse across one or more interfaces, the context object providing the criteria for determining one or more send steps at one of the interfaces (Resolve 204 page 3 paragraph 0024).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Puri with the teaching of Reistad because the teaching of Reistad would improve the system of Puri by providing a compact string of characters used to identify or name a resource and the main purpose of the identification is to enable interaction with representations of the resource over a network.

11. As to claim 3, Reistad teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the context object includes a name and a namespace, the context object used to select a send process for the message sent to at least one of assigned interfaces (“...CIM namespace...class name...” page 4 paragraph 0029).

12. As to claim 4, Reistad teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, further comprising storing the context object in a repository accessible by a runtime engine to communicate with the one or more interfaces (“...accessing...” page 3 paragraph 0024)

13. As to claims 5,7,13 and 15, see the rejection of claim 3 above.

14. As to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 4 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/21/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that (1) the Puri prior art does not define a context object that includes the abstraction of content of the message and as such does not teach assigning the context object one or more interfaces through which messages are communicated, and (2) the "resource identifier" of the Reistad prior art can not constitute a context object.

As to point (1), the Puri prior art discloses a process and network architectures for loosely coupling object and non-object oriented applications to a network object broker hub and network messaging system. The network messaging system implements publish-subscribe model in which all messages conform to a common **logical definition** (business object/context object) to all applications (i.e. common **logical definition**/business object is an abstraction of the content of the message because it is common to any message type). The common logical definition of such objects, records and other data structures is shared among the applications coupled to the network messaging system and describes the content of a message. Business objects as the common logical definition are embodied by a combination of high level APIs, low level APIs and data stores in each of the applications. Each business object is represented by the high level APIs and low level APIs (i.e. business object is assigned to the high level APIs and low level APIs). The higher level APIs representing the

Art Unit: 2194

business object are based on **the content of the message** and provide the necessary low level APIs for accessing the application's data stores (content of the message) to execute the business object.

As to point (2), the Examiner agrees the “resource identifier” alone does not constitute the “context object”, however the “resource identifier” is part of a common information model (CIM) class (object) that constitutes the “context object” (Reistad page 4 paragraph 0029).

The instant disclosure describes the context objects as follows: “Context objects 234 are predefined criteria to determine potential receivers of messages that must be distributed between software components and business partners during collaborative processing. Information about the context objects 234 are used in determining receiving application(s) prior to processing a complete message for distribution...” In the same vein the “resource identifier” of the Reistad prior art as part of the common information model class is used to identify/determine appropriate resource agent/resource that receives a message.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Anya whose telephone number is 571-272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 2194

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

cea.